

REMARKS

Claims 1-38 are now cancelled by this response. Claims 39-58 are newly added, with claims 39, 41, 43, 45, 47, 50, 53 and 56 being independent claims.

Claims 1-9, 18-24 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Chen et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,195,694). Claims 10 and 25-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chen et al.* as applied to claim 20, in view of *Newell et al.* (U.S. Patent 5,159,560). Claims 11, and 28-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chen* as applied to claim 1 in view of *Whitehouse* (U.S. Patent 5,319,562). Claims 12-17 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chen* as applied to claim 1 in view of *Whitehouse* (U.S. Patent 5,319,562) and *Newell et al.* (U.S. Patent 5,159,560).

Claims 31-38 were noted to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The statement of the reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter were stated by the Examiner as follows: "Recited limitations unambiguously describe a specific method for employing the item delivery and retrieval system for implementation of package pick-up; package exchange; club type; and postal packaging automated applications. This specific functionality is distinguishable over the more general postal packaging and purchasing automation methods as disclosed in the cited prior art. Particularly, *Chen* discloses a plurality of user-specific functions that are implemented through the associated plurality of applications as configured at a kiosk. However, *Chen* does not disclose a detailed method for a user to complete the various applications (e.g. banking, purchasing, item pick-up) employing kiosks but

rather addresses a method for accomplishing the user-specific reconfiguration of the kiosk so as to support the various applications.”

In this regard, a new set of claims comprising claims 39-58 is presented for examination.

Claims 39 and 47 are directed to the allowable subject matter of claims 20, 21 and 31. Claims 41 and 50 are directed to the allowable subject matter recited in claims 20, 21 and 33. Claims 43 and 53 are directed to the allowable subject matter noted in claims 20, 21 and 35, and claims 45 and 56 are directed to the allowable subject matter of claims 20, 21 and 37.

Dependent claims 31, 33, 35 and 37 are specifically directed to the limitation of Active X control. Claims 40, 49, 42-52, 44-55 and 46-58 and 58 are directed to a recitation that the common use terminal comprises a kiosk.

Accordingly, all of the newly submitted independent claims and the respective dependent claims which depend therefrom are deemed to be in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact William L. Gates, Reg. No. 20,848 at (703) 205-8000.

Application No. 10/099,947
Amendment dated August 24, 2005
Reply to Office Action of July 13, 2005

Docket No.: 1215-0461P

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment from or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. §1.17; particularly, the extension of time fees.

Dated: August 24, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By William L. Gates
William L. Gates
Registration No.: 20,848
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Rd
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant